1	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California MADO D. GREENBALIM	
2	MARC D. GREENBAUM Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
3	GILLIAN E. FRIEDMAN Deputy Attorney General	
5	State Bar No. 169207 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702	
	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2564	
6	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804 Attorneys for Complainant	
7	DEEOL	or wite
8	BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	STATE OF C	CALIFORNIA
10		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. C110513-04
12	TUPPER LIENKE	
13	1101 S. Ridgeley Drive Los Angeles, CA 90019	ACCUSATION
14		NCC C S II I I O I V
15	Certified General Appraiser License No. AG 001740	,
16	Respondent.	,
17		
18		
	Complainant alleges:	
19	1	TIES
19 20	PAR	TIES f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers
	PAR	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers
20	PAR  1. Elizabeth Seaters, acting on behalf or	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers
20 21	PAR  1. Elizabeth Seaters, acting on behalf of (Complainant), brings this Accusation solely in the Complainant.	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers
20 21 22	PAR  1. Elizabeth Seaters, acting on behalf of (Complainant), brings this Accusation solely in the Complainant.	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers  ner official capacity as Chief of Enforcement for  Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers
20 21 22 23 .	PAR  1. Elizabeth Seaters, acting on behalf of (Complainant), brings this Accusation solely in Parameter Complainant.  2. On or about December 17, 1991, the	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her official capacity as Chief of Enforcement for Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her AG 001740 to Tupper Lienke (Respondent).
20 21 22 23 24	PAR  1. Elizabeth Seaters, acting on behalf of (Complainant), brings this Accusation solely in Parameter (Complainant).  2. On or about December 17, 1991, the issued Certified General Appraiser License Num	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her official capacity as Chief of Enforcement for Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her AG 001740 to Tupper Lienke (Respondent). full force and effect at all times relevant to the
20 21 22 23 24 25	PAR  1. Elizabeth Seaters, acting on behalf of (Complainant), brings this Accusation solely in Factorial Complainant.  2. On or about December 17, 1991, the issued Certified General Appraiser License Num The Certified General Appraiser License was in	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her official capacity as Chief of Enforcement for Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her AG 001740 to Tupper Lienke (Respondent). full force and effect at all times relevant to the
20 21 22 23 24 25 26	PAR  1. Elizabeth Seaters, acting on behalf of (Complainant), brings this Accusation solely in Factorial Complainant.  2. On or about December 17, 1991, the issued Certified General Appraiser License Num The Certified General Appraiser License was in charges brought herein and will expire on May 9	f the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her official capacity as Chief of Enforcement for Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers her AG 001740 to Tupper Lienke (Respondent). full force and effect at all times relevant to the

## **JURISDICTION**

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, under the authority of the following laws.
  - 4. Business and Professions Code section 11313 states in pertinent part:

The duty of enforcing and administering provisions of the Real Estate Appraisers' Licensing and Certification Law is vested in the director. The director shall adopt and enforce rules and regulations as are determined reasonably necessary to carry out the purposes of this part. Those rules and regulations shall be adopted pursuant to Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

- 5. Business and Professions Code section 11314 states, in pertinent part: "The office is required to include in its regulations requirements for licensure and discipline of real estate appraisers that ensure protection of the public interest."
  - 6. Business and Professions Code section 11319 states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice constitute the minimum standard of conduct and performance for a licensee in any work or service performed that is addressed by those standards. If a licensee also is certified by the Board of Equalization, he or she shall follow the standards established by the Board of Equalization when fulfilling his or her responsibilities for assessment purposes.

7. Business and Professions Code section 11328 states:

To substantiate documentation of appraisal experience, or to facilitate the investigation of illegal or unethical activities by a licensee, applicant, or other person acting in a capacity that requires a license, that licensee, applicant, or person shall, upon the request of the director, submit copies of appraisals, or any work product which is addressed by the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, and all supporting documentation and data to the office. This material shall be confidential in accordance with the confidentiality provisions of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

8. California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 3701 states:

Every holder of a license under this part shall conform to and observe the

2.5

Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) and any subsequent amendments thereto as promulgated by the Appraisal Standards Board of The Appraisal Foundation which standards are herein incorporated into these regulations by reference as if fully set forth herein.

- 9. Title 10, California Code of Regulations section 3702 states that:
- (a) The Director finds and declares as follows:
- (1) That the profession of real estate appraisal is vested with a fiduciary relationship of trust and confidence as to clients, lending institutions, and both public and private guarantors or insurers of funds in federally-related real estate transactions and that the qualifications of honesty, candor, integrity, and trustworthiness are directly and substantially related to and indispensable to the practice of the appraisal profession;
  - 10. California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 3705 states in pertinent part:
- (a) Every appraisal report subject to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice upon final completion shall bear the signature and license number of the appraiser and of the supervising appraiser, if appropriate. The affixing of such signature and number constitute the acceptance by the appraiser and supervising appraiser of full and personal responsibility for the accuracy, content, and integrity of the appraisal under Standards Rules 1 and 2 of USPAP.
  - 11. California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 3721 states:
- (a) The Director may issue a citation, order of abatement, assess a fine or private or public reproval, suspend or revoke any license, and/or may deny the issuance or renewal of a license of any person who has:
  - (6) Violated any provision of USPAP;
- (7) Violated any provision of the Real Estate Appraisers' Licensing and Certification Law, Part 3 (commencing with Section 11300) of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code, or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto; or any provision of the Business and Professions Code applicable to applicants for or holders of licenses authorizing appraisals;

2

3

4

5

11

# Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice

In developing a real property appraisal, an appraiser must identify the problem to be solved, determine the scope of work necessary to solve the problem, and correctly complete research and

- (a) be aware of, understand, and correctly employ those recognized methods and techniques
- (b) not commit a substantial error of omission or commission that significantly affects an

- (e) identify the characteristics of the property that are relevant to the purpose and intended

When necessary for credible assignment results in developing a market value opinion, an

(b) develop an opinion of the highest and best use of the real estate.

three sections apply to all appraisal practice, and all four sections apply to appraisal practice performed under Standards 1 through 10.

Compliance with USPAP is required when either the service or the appraiser is obligated by law or regulation, or by agreement with the client or intended users, to comply. In addition to these requirements, an individual should comply any time that individual represents that he or she is performing the service as an appraiser.

An appraiser must not misrepresent his or her role when providing valuation services that are outside of appraisal practice.

#### Conduct:

An appraiser must perform assignments ethically and competently, in accordance with USPAP.

An appraiser must not engage in criminal conduct.

An appraiser must perform assignments with impartiality, objectivity, and independence, and without accommodation of personal interests.

An appraiser must not advocate the cause or interest of any party or issue.

An appraiser must not accept an assignment that includes the reporting of predetermined opinions and conclusions.

An appraiser must not communicate assignment results in a misleading or fraudulent manner. An appraiser must not use or communicate a misleading or fraudulent report or knowingly permit an employee or other person to communicate a misleading or fraudulent report.

An appraiser must not use or rely on unsupported conclusions relating to characteristics such as race, color, religion, national origin, gender, marital status, familial status, age, receipt of public assistance income, handicap, or an unsupported conclusion that homogeneity of such characteristics is necessary to maximize value.

26 | ///

28 | ///

## 21. The USPAP Competency Rule states:

Prior to accepting an assignment or entering into an agreement to perform any assignment, an appraiser must properly identify the problem to be addressed and have the knowledge and experience to complete the assignment competently; or alternatively, must:

- 1. disclose the lack of knowledge and/or experience to the client before accepting the assignment;
  - 2. take all steps necessary or appropriate to complete the assignment competently; and
- 3. describe the lack of knowledge and/or experience and the steps taken to complete the assignment competently in the report.
  - 22. USPAP Scope of Work Rule, states:

For each appraisal, appraisal review, and appraisal consulting assignment, an appraiser must:

- 1. identify the problem to be solved;
- 2. determine and perform the scope of work necessary to develop credible assignment results; and
  - 3. disclose the scope of work in the report.

An appraiser must properly identify the problem to be solved in order to determine the appropriate scope of work. The appraiser must be prepared to demonstrate that the scope of work is sufficient to produce credible assignment results.

Problem Identification

An appraiser must gather and analyze information about those assignment elements that are necessary to properly identify the appraisal, appraisal review or appraisal consulting problem to be solved.

Scope of Work Acceptability

The scope of work must include the research and analyses that are necessary to develop credible assignment results.

An appraiser must not allow assignment conditions to limit the scope of work to such a degree that the assignment results are not credible in the context of the intended use.

An appraiser must not allow the intended use of an assignment or a client's objectives to cause the assignment results to be biased.

Disclosure Obligations

The report must contain sufficient information to allow intended users to understand the scope of work performed.

## **COST RECOVERY AND FINES**

23. Code section 11409, subdivision (a), states:

Except as otherwise provided by law, any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding may direct a licensee, applicant for licensure, person who acts in a capacity that requires a license under this part, course provider, applicant for course provider accreditation, or a person who, or entity that, acts in a capacity that requires course provider accreditation found to have committed a violation or violations of statutes or regulations relating to Certified General Appraiser practice to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of investigation, enforcement, and prosecution of the case.

- 24. Code section 11316, subdivision (a) states:
- (a) The director may assess a fine against a licensee, applicant for licensure, person who acts in a capacity that requires a license under this part, course provider, applicant for course provider accreditation, or a person who, or entity that, acts in a capacity that requires course provider accreditation for violation of this part or any regulations adopted to carry out its purposes.

## FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Misleading and Inaccurate Appraisal Report)

25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code sections 11313 and 11319, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 3701, for violating Regulation section 3721, subdivisions (a)(6) and (a)(7) in that on or about January 24, 2008, Respondent completed a real estate appraisal report, with an effective date of January 23, 2008 and opinion of value of \$4.10 per square foot for market rent of improved commercial units in a strip center commonly known as 711 Foothill Boulevard Units B, C, D, &

E, La Canada, California (Foothill Boulevard Property). The intended use of the report was for arbitration to calculate the value of the rent of the space. The report contained errors or omissions, in violation of Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) as follows:

- (a) Respondent failed to report the intended use of the appraisal report. Specifically, the report fails to state that it will be used to determine the market value of the Foothill Boulevard Property. (S.R. 1-2(b) and 2-2(b)(ii));
- (b) Respondent failed to identify all of the intended users of his report in his appraisal. Respondent identified only his client as an intended user; however, he omitted the names of intended users in the arbitration that included Dale Donerkiel (Donerkiel) who was selected as the arbitrator to serve in connection with the litigation matter. (S.R. 1-2(a), 2-2(b)(i) and Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule);
- (c) Respondent failed to accurately describe and complete the scope of work of the appraisal for the Foothill Boulevard Property. Specifically, Respondent failed to show the existing rent schedule for the subject commercial strip center; failed to obtain and analyze prior leases for the subject property; failed to report that he did not research the data in his report; and failed to state that he plagerized the valuation section prepared by Donerkiel. Respondent also failed to review leases, interview brokers and tenants in competing strip centers. (S.R. 1-2(h), 2-2(b)(vii) and Scope of Work Rule and Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule);
- (d) Respondent failed to report and analyze relevant market conditions. The subject appraisal report did not contain sufficient information regarding the demand and supply of commercial space in the area. Moreover, it failed to analyze vacancy rates and rent rates (S.R. 1-1(a), 1-1(b), 1-2(e)(i), and 2-2(b)(ii));
- (e) Respondent failed to adequately describe and analyze the Foothill Boulevard Property. Respondent included a site plan in the appraisal report; however, he failed to identify the location of the subject property at the back of the commercial center, without any street exposure. The report fails to include a sketch diagram, which shows that the subject consists of a single suite, not three (3) suites. (S.R. 1-1(a), 1-2(e)(i), 2-2(b)(iii));

- Property and analyze the zoning restrictions on the property. Specifically, Respondent failed to discuss that the zoning required a conditional use permit that included a limitation of the occupancy of the property during certain hours of the day. The report also failed to discuss the amount of parking needed for office and retail, and the amount of parking that was available (S.R. 1-1(a), 1-1(b), 1-2(e)(i), 2-1(a), 2-1(b), and 2-2(b)(iii));
- (g) Respondent failed to complete a highest and best use analysis on the Foothill Boulevard Property. The report failed to compare and analyze whether the best use of the space was for office versus retail use and to support the conclusion of said analysis. Moreover, Respondent failed to include a discussion regarding the demand for various sizes of lease spaces in the report. In so far as the Foothill Boulevard Property involved a space that had been converted into a single suite, the report should have discussed the cost of converting the property back into multiple suites. It fails to discuss the demand for the tenant improvements which convert the space from retail to office. It fails to discuss the necessity of a conditional use permit for office use. (S.R. 1-1(a), 1-2(e)(i), 1-3(b), 2-2(b)(iii)); and
- (h) Respondent rendered appraisal services in a grossly dishonest manner where he copied the valuation section of Donerkiel's appraisal report. Respondent misrepresented that he had no assistance in preparing the appraisal report for the Foothill Boulevard Property when in fact most of the report was plagiarized. (Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule, California Code of Regulations Sections 3702(a)(1)).

#### SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(False Statements/Violation of fiduciary relationship)

26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code sections 11313 and 11319, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 3701, for violating Regulation section 3702, subdivisions (a)(1) in that on or about April 11, 2008, Respondent testified during a deposition regarding a real estate appraisal report for the Foothill Boulevard Property. The testimony contains violations of the provisions of the violations of the provisions of the USPAP, and the California Code of Regulations as follows:

(a) Respondent made false statement(s) during his testimony under oath regarding the preparation of his appraisal report for the Foothill Boulevard Property. Specifically, Respondent gave contradictory testimony where he initially denied the involvement of Donerkiel in his appraisal report and subsequently acknowledged Donerkiel's contribution, but failed to admit that he plagiarized portions of the report (Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule and the California Code of Regulations Section 3702(a)(1)).

#### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Misleading and Inaccurate Appraisal Report)

- 27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code sections 11313 and 11319, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 3701, for violating Regulation section 3721, subdivisions (a)(6) and (a)(7) in that Respondent completed an Amended Report for the Foothill Boulevard Property dated January 24, 2008. The report contains certain errors or omissions, listed below, which are violations of the provisions of the violations of the provisions of the USPAP, the California Business and Professions Code, and the California Code of Regulations as follows:
- (a) Respondent produced an appraisal report titled as an Amended Report that disclosed that Donerkiel had provided significant appraisal assistance. The amended report, however, failed to convey that Respondent plagerized Donerkiel's report and that Respondent's appraisal report was not an independent opinion of value (S.R. Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule, California Code of Regulations Section 3702(a)(1));
- (b) Respondent failed to state in his amended appraisal report that Donerkiel was an intended user of his report as Donerkiel had been appointed to serve as the arbitrator over the issue of the market valuation of the Foothill Boulevard Property (S.R. 2-3 and Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule);
- (c) Respondent failed to state his scope of work for producing his amended appraisal report (S.R. 1-2(h), Scope of Work Rule and Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule); and

///

(d) By his amended report, Respondent failed to correct any of the errors mentioned in paragraphs 24a-24h, which are incorporated herein by this reference. (Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule).

### FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Misleading and Inaccurate Appraisal Report)

- 28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code sections 11313 and 11319, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 3701, for violating Regulation section 3721, subdivisions (a)(6) and (a)(7) in that Respondent completed a review appraisal dated April 1, 2008 to critique the appraisal report prepared by Catherine Morrissey (Morrissey) for the Foothill Boulevard Property. The review appraisal report contains certain errors or omissions, listed below, which are violations of the provisions of the violations of the provisions of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP), and the California Code of Regulations as follows:
- (a) Respondent failed to state in his report that his conclusions in the review appraisal were dependent upon data received from another appraiser, specifically from Donerkiel's appraisal report and Respondent failed to place his name in the certification; (S.R. 2-3 and Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule);
- (b) Respondent failed to disclose in his review report that he had previously appraised the Foothill Boulevard Property for the same intended use and had a predetermined opinion of value. (Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule); and
- (c) Respondent failed to limit the scope of his review report to commenting about the data and methodology in Morrissey's report (Conduct Section of the Ethics Rule).

#### **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Real Estate Appraiser License Number AG 001740, issued to Tupper Lienke

1	2. Ordering Tupper Lienke to pay the Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers	
2	the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and	
3	Professions Code section 11409;	
4	3. Ordering Tupper Lienke to pay the Director of the Office of Real Estate Appraisers a	
5	fine pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 11316; and	
6	<ol> <li>Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.</li> </ol>	
7	10 Au (5 May 8 1 May)	
8	Ovininal Signed	
9	DATED: 12/11/12 Original Signed ELIZABETH SEATERS	
10	Chief of Enforcement Office of Real Estate Appraisers	
11	State of California  Complainant	
12		
13		
14	v	
15	9	
16	LA2012507760 51180331.doc	
17	w .	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22 23		
24		
25	*	
26		
27		
28		
	14	